

MINUTES OF JULY 6, 2015

The regular meeting of the Sussex County Board of Adjustment was held on Monday, July 6, 2015, at 7:00 p.m. in the County Council Chambers, Administrative Office Building, Georgetown, Delaware.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. with Chairman Dale Callaway presiding. The Board members present were: Mr. Dale Callaway, Mr. John Mills, Mr. Jeff Hudson, Mr. Brent Workman, and Mr. Norman Rickard, with James Sharp and Vince Robertson – Assistant County Attorney, and staff members Lawrence Lank – Director of Planning and Zoning Ms. Janelle Cornwell – Planning and Zoning Manager and Ms. Kelly Passwaters – Zoning Inspector, II.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Mr. Callaway.

Motion by Mr. Mill, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried unanimously to approve the Revised Agenda as circulated. Motion carried 5 – 0.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Hudson, and carried unanimously to approve the Minutes and Findings of Fact for May 18, 2015 as circulated. Motion carried 5 – 0.

Mr. Sharp read a statement explaining how the Board of Adjustment meeting is conducted and the procedures for hearing the cases.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Case No. 11602 – Sahaj Anand Rehoboth Hospitality, L.L.C. – seeks a variance to reduce the parking spaces required for a hotel or motel (Section 115-162A of the Sussex County Zoning Ordinance). The property is located on the south side of Airport Rd. approximately 210 ft. southwest of Rt.1. 911 Address: 36012 Airport Rd. Rehoboth Beach. Zoning District: C-1. Tax Map 334-13.00-178.02.

Ms. Cornwell presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning had received one (1) letter in opposition to the Application and had not received any correspondence in support of the Application.

Mr. Sharp recused himself from participating. Mr. Vince Robertson was present to represent council for the Board, since Mr. Sharp recused himself from the hearing due to a conflict. Mr. Sharp left the Chambers during the public hearing.

Lynn Hopkins and John Murray were sworn in to testify about the Application. Tim Willard, Esquire, presented the case to the Board on behalf of the Applicant and submitted exhibits for the Board to review.

Mr. Willard stated that the Applicant is requesting a variance of 0.3 parking space per rental room or suite from the required 1.5 required parking space per rental room or suite

requirement; that the existing hotel has forty-nine (49) rooms; that the existing seventy-four (74) parking spaces meet the requirement; that the Applicant is proposing to add twenty-two (22) additional rooms; that the current code would require one-hundred and nine (109) parking spaces with the additional rooms; that the proposed plan has eighty-seven (87) parking spaces available; that the property is uniquely shaped due to the curvature of Airport Road and triangular; that there is an existing storm water management pond and access easement on the property; that the existing hotel was not designed by the Applicant; that the Applicant purchased the property in 2013; that it will not alter the character of the neighborhood; and that the hotel has had no past issues with parking overflow.

Mr. Murray stated that he is a project manager with Kercher Engineering; that the Applicant hired them to design the plan for the proposed extension to the hotel; that there is a demand for more rooms; that there is no available space to expand the parking lot, due to the existing structure, road, access easement and stormwater pond; that they plan to enhance the existing parking lot by reducing the parking space size to meet the current code of 9'x 18'; that they are increasing the number of handicap parking spaces from two (2) to four (4); that they will also have seventeen (17) compact car parking spaces; that all parking spaces are eighteen (18) feet in length; that the compact car parking spaces are only eight (8) feet wide; that the proposed parking lot allows 1.2 parking spaces per rental room; that the hotel had forty-six (46) rooms rented on July 5, 2015; that a 6:00 a.m. on July 5, 2015 there were forty-eight (48) cars in the parking lot, one being the manager's vehicle; and that there were still twenty-six (26) parking spaces available.

Ms. Hopkins stated that she is a manager of the existing hotel; that occupancy during the months January through April do not exceed forty percent (40%); that the highest occupancy is during July and August; that during a calendar year the occupancy percentage rarely exceeds seventy percent (70%); that this past holiday weekend the hotel reached 100% occupancy; that during this weekend with all forty-nine (49) rooms rented there were only forty-two (42) parking spaces used by the guests; that a majority of guests may rent more than one room; however, travel in one (1) vehicle; that another time with forty-six (46) rooms rented the guests used forty-eight (48) parking spaces; that two (2) rooms rented had two (2) vehicles; and that a picture was submitted showing approximately fifteen (15) parking spaces were open when the hotel is rented at full capacity.

Mr. Willard stated that based on five (5) years of history that even at one-hundred percent (100%) occupancy there will still be parking spaces available; that the variance is necessary to enable reasonable use of the property; that it cannot otherwise be developed in strict conformity; that it is the minimum variance necessary to afford relief; and that the proposed parking spaces will still exceed the amount of parking needed to provide adequate use for their guests.

Sanford Hazzard and Jeron Duffy were sworn in and testified in opposition to the Application; that the existing stormwater pond is used by both the hotel and the neighboring

property; that he has added fencing and gates due to parking issues; that the existing 25-foot easement between his property and the hotel is for the Duffy family; that the easement is for use of the Duffy family only and as a fire lane; that the hotel uses the easement for deliveries and trash pick-up; that increasing the number of rooms and not providing adequate parking will adversely affect his property; that he is concerned where larger vehicles will park since the parking spaces will be smaller; that larger vehicles also take up numerous spaces at a time; that guests of the hotel park in the easement; and that the additional rooms will create more congestion and more problems for the surrounding properties.

In rebuttal, Mr. Willard, stated that there are approximately thirteen (13) parking spaces that are rarely used; that they will still be available to the patrons of the hotel; that the Applicant owns the easement; that they do use the easement for deliveries and trash pick-up; that there is not a large number of tractor trailers throughout a year; that they have an agreement with God's Way to use their parking for large vehicles; and that the parking is rarely at capacity.

The Board found that no parties appeared in support of the Application.

The Board found that two (2) parties appeared in opposition to the Application.

Motion by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Workman, and carried unanimously to take the case under advisement. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Mills – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

At the conclusion of the public hearings, the Chairman referred back to this case. Mr. Mills stated that he would move that the Board recommend denial of Variance Application No. 11602 for the requested variances based on the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons:

1. The Property is not unique in shape or circumstance;
2. The Property can be otherwise developed in strict conformity with the Sussex County Zoning Ordinance;
3. The variance is not necessary to enable reasonable use of the Property;
4. The exceptional practical difficulty has been created by the Applicant; and
5. The variance will alter the essential character of the neighborhood.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried unanimously that the variance be **denied for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Mills – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Mr. Sharp returned and resumed his duties as attorney for the Board.

Case No. 11598 – Peggi Anne Landis – seeks a variance to reduce the side yard setback (Section 115-42B of the Sussex County Zoning Ordinance). The property is located on the southeast side of Canvasback Rd. 0.24 miles north of Swann Dr. within Swann Keys development. 911 Address: 37022 Canvasback Rd., Selbyville. Zoning District GR. Tax Map: 533-12.16-390.00

Ms. Cornwell presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning had not received any correspondence in support of or in opposition to the Application.

Peggi Landis was sworn in to testify about the Application. James Fuqua, Esquire, presented the case to the Board on behalf of the Applicant and submitted exhibits for the Board to review.

Mr. Fuqua stated that the Applicant is requesting a variance of 3.9 feet from the required ten (10) foot side yard setback requirement for a proposed covered landing, a variance of 8.2 feet from the required ten (10) foot side yard setback requirement for a proposed HVAC, and a variance of five (5) feet from the required ten (10) foot side yard setback requirement for a proposed dwelling; that the existing single-wide manufactured home will be removed; that the lot measures 40'x 104' and contains 4,158-square-feet in area; that the proposed dwelling is in character with the neighborhood; that the development was once a manufactured home park; that the proposed dwelling will measure 24'x 61'; that there have been numerous variances granted in the area; that the entire community is replacing single-wide units with larger dwellings; that the lot is unique in size; that the variance will enable reasonable use of the property; that the difficulty was not created by the Applicant; that the variances are similar to other variances previously granted in the development; and that the variances requested are the minimum variances to afford relief.

Ms. Landis, under oath, confirmed the statements made by Mr. Fuqua.

The Board found that no parties appeared in support of or in opposition to the Application.

Mr. Rickard stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Variance Application No. 11598 for the requested variances based on the record made at the public hearings and for the following reasons:

1. The 40'x 104' lot is unique in size;
2. The variances are necessary to enable reasonable use of the Property;
3. The exceptional practical difficulty was not created by the Applicant;
4. The variances will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood;

5. The variances sought are the minimum variances necessary to afford relief; and
6. The variances represent the least modification of the regulation at issue.

Motion by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Workman, and carried unanimously that the variances be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call: Mr. Mills – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11599 – James and Kelli Boothe – seeks a variance to reduce the side yard and rear yard setbacks (Section 115-25C of the Sussex County Zoning Ordinance). The property is located west side of Grant Ave. approximately 367 ft. south of Lincoln Dr. 911 Address: 38753 Grant Ave Ext. Selbyville. Zoning District: AR-1. Tax Map 533-20.14-25.00

Ms. Cornwell presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning had not received any correspondence in support of or in opposition to the Application.

James Boothe and Irving Harbough were sworn in and testified about the Application. James Fuqua, Esquire, presented the case to the Board on behalf of the Applicant and submitted exhibits for the Board to review.

Mr. Fuqua stated that the Applicant is requesting a variance of five (5) feet from the required ten (10) foot side yard setback requirement and a variance of five (5) feet from the required twenty (20) foot rear yard setback requirement for a proposed dwelling; that the development was once a manufactured home park and is evolving into single family residences; that the existing manufactured home was removed prior to the Applicant's purchase; that the proposed dwelling will measure 27'x 58'; that the small lot is under 5,000 SF in size; that the proposed dwelling is similar to other dwellings in the area; that the variances are necessary to enable reasonable use of the property; that the difficulty was not created by the Applicant; that the variances are the minimum variances to afford relief; that there have been numerous variances granted in the development; that the community is unique; that it will not alter the essential character to the neighborhood; that the dwelling will be on nine (9) foot pilings; that the proposed HVAC will meet setback requirements; and that the proposed location of the dwelling will allow room for parking on the property.

The Board found that no parties appeared in support of or in opposition to the Application.

Mr. Rickard stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Varince Application No. 11599 for the requested variances based on the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons:

1. The undersized lot makes the Property unique;
2. The variances are necessary to enable reasonable use of the Property;
3. The exceptional practical difficulty was not created by the Applicant;
4. The variances will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood;
5. The variances sought are the minimum variances to afford relief; and
6. The requested variances represent the least modification of the regulation at issue.

Motion by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Workman, and carried unanimously that the variances be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call: Mr. Mills – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11600 – Terry R. Lowe – seeks a variance to reduce the side yard setback (Section 115-42B of the Sussex County Zoning Ordinance). The property is located on the south side of Piney Point Rd. 0.22 miles west of Cedar Neck Rd. 911 Address: 38211 Piney Point Rd. Ocean View. Zoning District: GR. Tax Map 134-9.00-52.00

Ms. Cornwell presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning had not received any correspondence in support of or in opposition to the Application.

Terry Lowe was sworn in and testified requesting a variance of 3.2 feet from the required five (5) foot side yard setback requirement for an existing shed, a variance of 4.3 feet from the required five (5) foot side yard setback requirement for an existing shed, and a variance of 3.7 feet from the required ten (10) foot side yard setback requirement for an existing dwelling; that his parents purchased the property in 1977; that no survey was done at time of purchase; that two (2) of the sheds and dwelling existed on the property at the time of purchase; that the dwelling was built in the 1960's; that in 1990 his father obtained a permit for the third shed; that his father made a mistake when placing the shed; that the sheds cannot be moved into compliance due to existing trees on the property; that his mother's will has directed that the property be sold; that it will not alter the character of the neighborhood, since the structures have been on the property for over twenty-five (25) years; that the difficulty was not created by the Applicant; that the variances are the minimum variances to afford relief; and that the lot is only sixty (60) feet wide making it unique in size.

The Board found that no parties appeared in support of or in opposition to the Application.

Mr. Mills stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Variance Application No. 11600 for the requested variances based on the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons:

1. The narrow sixty (60) foot wide lot is unique in size;
2. The variances are necessary to enable reasonable use of the Property;
3. The exceptional practical difficulty was not created by the Applicant;
4. The variances will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood; and
5. The variances sought are the minimum variances to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Hudson, and carried unanimously that the variances be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call: Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Mills – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11601 – Estuary Development, LLC c/o Meris Properties, LLC – seeks a special use exception to place a temporary manufactured home type structure as a sales office (Section 115-23A & 115-210A(1) of the Sussex County Zoning Ordinance). The property is located on the southwest side of Camp Barnes Rd. approximately 0.58 miles south of Double Bridges Rd. 911 Address: 36364 Camp Barnes Rd. Frankford. Zoning District: AR-1. Tax Map: 134-19.00-116.00

Ms. Cornwell presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning had received one (1) letter in support of the Application and had not received any correspondence in opposition to the Application.

Lawton Myrick and Steven Broadwick were sworn in and testified requesting a special use exception to place a temporary manufactured home type structure as a sales office; that the preliminary site plan approval for The Estuary Development was granted in May 2014; that they are close to having all agency approvals for final site plan approval; that the temporary sales office request is for two (2) years; that they anticipate only needing the structure for approximately nine (9) months; that the unit will be removed once the model dwelling has been constructed; that there will be eight (8) parking spaces available and one (1) handicap accessible parking space; that the unit will measure 24'x 60' and have a covered porch; that there will be a temporary holding tank on site for facilities; that the unit will have ADA access and have landscaping; that they used the same unit for a prior project; and that the use will not substantially adversely affect the neighboring and adjacent properties, since the unit will be placed in the center of a four-hundred (400) acre parcel.

The Board found that no parties appeared in support of or in opposition to the Application.

Mr. Mills stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Special Use Exception Application No. 11601 for the requested special use exception based on the record

made at the public hearing because the use does not substantially adversely affect the uses of neighboring and adjacent properties.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Rickard, and carried unanimously that the special use exception be **granted for a period of two (2) years and for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Mills – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11603 – B P G Properties – seeks a special use exception to place a billboard, and variances from the height requirement, maximum square footage, side yard and rear yard setbacks for a billboard (Section 115-80(C), 115-210A(3)(6), 115-159.5(B)(2)(3), & 115-159.5(C) of the Sussex County Zoning Ordinance). The property is located on the west side of Coastal Hwy. (Rt. 1) approximately 1000 ft. north of John J. Williams Hwy. (Rt. 24). 911 Address: 18756 Coastal Hwy. Rehoboth Beach. Zoning District: C-1. Tax Map 334-12.00-90.00

Ms. Cornwell presented the case and stated that the Office of Planning and Zoning had not received any correspondence in support of or in opposition to the Application.

Dale McCallister and Preston Dyer were sworn in and testified requesting a special use exception to place a billboard, a variance of twenty-two (22) feet from the required twenty-five (25) foot maximum height requirement for a billboard, a variance of 912 SF from the maximum 600 SF allowable square footage for a billboard, a variance of 39.28 feet from the required three-hundred (300) foot separation requirement from a dwelling, a variance of 47.61 feet from the required three-hundred (300) foot separation requirement from a dwelling, a variance of 32.05 feet from the required three-hundred (300) foot separation requirement from a dwelling, a variance of 48.5 feet from the required fifty (50) foot side yard setback requirement for a billboard, and asking to allow two (2) signs per side of the proposed billboard; that he submitted a letter of support from the neighboring property owner; that the existing billboard is in poor shape and in need of repair; that the neighbor has requested that the proposed billboard be raised and exceed the twenty-five (25) feet maximum height requirement; that the neighbor also requested the billboard be setback from the front property line approximately fifty (50) feet; that the height and front yard setback request is to allow visibility of his existing business; that the Applicant did not create the existing condition of the billboard; that the variances are the minimum to afford relief; that the proposed billboard will meet all State of Delaware requirements; that the proposed billboard will have less impact on the neighbor's property; that the bottom billboard will be twenty-four (24) feet from grade; that there will be one (1) foot between the billboard to allow enough room to wrap the signage; that if unable to have two (2) signs per side would create a financial hardship; that the existing billboards were rented during the pending application; that the location is a prime site and believe they will have no problem

leasing the proposed billboards; and that the use will not substantially adversely affect the uses of the neighboring and adjacent properties.

The Board found that no parties appeared in support of or in opposition to the Application.

Mr. Rickard stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Special Use/Variance Application No. 11603 for the requested special use exception based on the record made at the public hearing because the use does not substantially adversely affect the uses of the neighboring and adjacent properties and for the requested variances based on the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons:

1. The uniqueness of the property is the existing issue with the existing billboard blocking the neighboring business;
2. The variances are necessary to enable reasonable use of the Property;
3. The exceptional practical difficulty was not created by the Applicant;
4. The variances will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood; and
5. The variances sought are the minimum variances to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Workman, and carried unanimously that the special use exception and variances be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Mills – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

OLD BUSINESS

Case No. 11588 – Clear Channel Outdoors, Inc. – seeks a special use exception to place an off-premise sign, and seeks a variance a reduction from the maximum square footage and maximum height requirement for an off-premise sign (Section 115-80C, 115-210(3)(6), 115-159.5 B(3), and 115-159.5(C) of the Sussex County Zoning Ordinance). The property is located west side of Route One (Coastal Hwy.) approximately 846 ft. north of Willow Creek Rd. 911 Address: 16218 Coastal Hwy., Lewes. Zoning District C-1. Tax Map 235-23.00-52.01

The Board discussed this case, which has been tabled since June 22, 2015.

Mr. Rickard stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval in part and denial in part of Special Use Exception/Variance Application No. 11588. Mr. Rickard moved that the special use exception be approved based on the record made at the public hearing because the use does not substantially affect adversely the uses of the adjacent and neighboring properties.

Mr. Rickard moved that the height variance and the maximum square footage variance be denied based on the record made at the public hearing and for the following reasons:

1. The Property is not unique in size or circumstance;
2. The Property can be otherwise developed in strict conformity with the Sussex County Zoning Ordinance;
3. The exceptional practical difficulty is being created by the Applicant; and
4. The variances sought are not necessary to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Rickard, seconded by Mr. Workman, and carried that the special use exception be **granted for the reasons stated and that the variances be denied for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 4 – 1.

The vote by roll; Mr. Mills – nay, Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

Case No. 11596 – John David Amos – seeks a variance from the maximum square footage for a garage/studio apartment (Section 115-40C of the Sussex County Zoning Ordinance). The property is located south side of Cannon St. approximately 452 ft. east of Forest Dr. within the Orchard Manor Subdivision. 911 Address: 28251 Cannon St., Millsboro. Tax Map 234-35.05-18.00

Ms. Cornwell presented the case to the Board, which had been left open at the June 22, 2015 meeting to allow the Applicant more time to prepare his case.

John David Amos was sworn in and testified requesting a variance of 332 SF from the maximum 800 SF allowable square footage for a garage/studio apartment; that the property is unique in the fact that when he purchased the property the previous owner had already converted the first floor into living space; that the second floor is needed to provide a bedroom; that the proposed staircase is considered square-footage by the Building Code Department; that he purchased the property for the potential rental income; that the proposed garage/studio apartment enhances the property value; that the existing structure can no longer function as a garage; that he did not create the exceptional practical difficulty; that it will not alter the character of the neighborhood, since there will be change to the exterior appearance of the structure; that it will not be detrimental to the public welfare; that the use will not impair the uses or development of neighboring and adjacent properties; that the variance is the minimum variance to afford relief and meet the Building Code requirements; that the second floor ceiling height does not allow for accessibility; and that the total square footage of the garage/studio apartment will be 1,132 SF.

The Board found that no parties appeared in support of or in opposition to the Application.

Mr. Mills stated that he would move that the Board recommend approval of Variance Application No. 11596 for the requested variance based on the public hearing and for the following reasons:

1. The unique circumstance of the Property is that the previous owner had already began construction of the apartment;
2. The variance is necessary to enable reasonable use of the Property;
3. The exceptional practical difficulty was not created by the Applicant;
4. The variance will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood; and
5. The variance sought is the minimum variance to afford relief.

Motion by Mr. Mills, seconded by Mr. Hudson, and carried unanimously that the variance be **granted for the reasons stated**. Motion carried 5 – 0.

The vote by roll call; Mr. Rickard – yea, Mr. Workman – yea, Mr. Hudson – yea, Mr. Mills – yea, and Mr. Callaway – yea.

OTHER BUSINESS

Reorganization

Mr. Callaway appointed Mr. Lank as Acting Chairman for the purpose of holding an Election of Officers.

Mr. Lank opened the nominations for Chairman.

Motion by Mr. Mills, and seconded by Mr. Rickard, to nominate Mr. Callaway as Chairman.

Motion by Mr. Hudson and seconded by Mr. Mills that the nominations for Chairman be closed.

Motion was adopted to nominate Mr. Callaway as Chairman with 5 – 0 vote.

Voted for Mr. Callaway, as Chairman, by roll call:

Mr. Workman -	yea
Mr. Rickard -	yea
Mr. Hudson -	yea
Mr. Mills -	yea
Mr. Callaway -	yea

Mr. Lank opened the nominations for Vice-Chairman.

Motion by Mr. Workman and seconded by Mr. Rickard to nominate Mr. Mills for Vice-Chairman.

Motion by Mr. Hudson and seconded by Mr. Workman that the nominations for Vice-Chairman be closed.

Motion by was adopted to nominate Mr. Mills as Vice-Chairman with 5 – 0 vote.

Voted for Mr. Mills, as Vice-Chairman, by roll call:

Mr. Workman -	yea
Mr. Rickard -	yea
Mr. Hudson -	yea
Mr. Mills -	yea
Mr. Callaway -	yea

The meeting was turned over to Mr. Callaway, the re-elected Chairman.

Motion was made by Mr. Mills and seconded by Mr. Rickard to appoint Ms. Janelle Cornwell as Secretary to the Board, with 5 – 0 vote.

Voted for Ms. Cornwell, as Secretary to the Board, by roll call:

Mr. Workman -	yea
Mr. Rickard -	yea
Mr. Hudson -	yea
Mr. Mills -	yea
Mr. Callaway -	yea

Meeting Adjourned 9:36 p.m.